

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIMINAL NO. _____
v.	:	DATE FILED: _____
OMAR BRASWELL and	:	VIOLATIONS:
TROY PONTON	:	21 U.S.C. § 846
	:	(Conspiracy to distribute 50 grams or
	:	more of cocaine base (“crack”)
	:	-1 count)
	:	21 U.S.C. §841(a)(1) (Distribution of 50
	:	grams or more of cocaine base (“crack”)-2
	:	counts)
	:	18 U.S.C. § 2 (Aiding and abetting)
	:	

INDICTMENT

COUNT ONE

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES THAT:

On or about October 25, 2006, in Philadelphia in the Eastern District of
Pennsylvania, defendants

OMAR BRASWELL

and

TROY PONTON

knowingly and intentionally conspired and agreed, together and with other persons unknown to
the grand jury, to distribute 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base
“crack,” a Schedule II controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code,
Sections 846.

MANNER AND MEANS

1. It was part of the conspiracy that defendants BRASWELL and PONTON participated in delivery of quantities of cocaine base (“crack”) in the vicinity of
th in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

It was further part of the conspiracy that:

2. When defendant PONTON arranged to deliver a quantity of cocaine base (“crack”) to undercover police posing as buyers, defendant PONTON contacted defendant BRASWELL by cellular phone to secure said amount.

3. Defendant BRASWELL “cooked” cocaine into (“crack”) and delivered the requested quantity of cocaine base (“crack”) to defendant PONTON.

4. Defendant BRASWELL waited for defendant PONTON to deliver the cocaine base (“crack”) to buyers so that defendant BRASWELL could in turn receive payment.

OVERT ACTS

In furtherance of the conspiracy, and to accomplish its object, defendants BRASWELL and PONTON, and others unknown to the grand jury, committed and caused to be committed the following overt acts, among others, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

1. On October 25, 2006, Philadelphia Police Officers were present when a confidential informant (CI) contacted defendant PONTON by telephone and discussed with him arrangements for meeting with undercover officers for the purpose of the purchasing of a quantity of cocaine base (“crack”) later that day.

2. On October 25, 2006, Philadelphia Police Officers waited in a vehicle for

the appearance of defendant PONTON, who arrived in a 2006 Dodge Magnum station wagon and joined the officers in their vehicle. Defendant PONTON discussed with officers details of quantity and price for the purchase of cocaine base (“crack”) and confirmed by visual inspection that the buyers possessed cash for payment.

3. Defendant PONTON, while in the presence of police officers, used his cell phone to contact defendant Braswell and represented that they must wait while the cocaine is cooked into “crack,” after which it would be brought to their location.

4. During the period awaiting delivery, defendant PONTON made statements to the police officers boasting of his success in trafficking narcotics and credited such success to his trustworthiness among associates and clientele in the business.

5. After waiting forty minutes, defendant PONTON received a cellular phone call from defendant BRASWELL, alerting him that he had arrived with the “crack” cocaine.

6. Defendant PONTON briefly walked to the alley in the rear of 900 Duncannon Avenue and met with and received from defendant BRASWELL, a clear plastic bag containing chunks of “crack” cocaine.

7. Defendant PONTON met with the undercover officers, who were posing as buyers, and displayed to them a clear plastic bag containing chunks of “crack” cocaine, while defendant BRASWELL stood by awaiting payment in the rear of 900 Duncannon Avenue.

All in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 846 and Section 841(a)(1).

COUNT TWO

THE GRAND JURY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:

On or about October 25, 2006, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, defendant

OMAR BRASWELL

knowingly and intentionally distributed cocaine base (“crack”) in excess of 50 grams, that is 120 grams of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of cocaine, a Schedule II controlled substance.

In violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 841(a)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

COUNT THREE

THE GRAND JURY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:

On or about October 25, 2006, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District
of Pennsylvania, defendant

TROY PONTON

knowingly and intentionally distributed cocaine base (“crack”), in excess of 50 grams, that is 120
grams, of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of cocaine, a Schedule II
controlled substance.

In violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1), and Title 18,
United States Code, Section 2.

A TRUE BILL:

GRAND JURY FOREPERSON

PATRICK L. MEEHAN
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY